

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-10, 12, 14-19 and 22-24 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1 and 22 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated May 28, 2007, Claims 1-10, 12, 14-19 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-10, 12, 14-19 and 22-24 remain in this application with new dependent Claim 25 being added by this Amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Queler for the courtesy of a telephone interview on July 10, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited reference does not anticipate or render obvious the claims as currently amended. In agreement, the Examiner stated that the amendments overcome the cited reference, but that an updated search would be necessary. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated May 28, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-10, 12, 14-19 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Unicode Standard Annex #9, The Bidirectional Algorithm" by Mark Davis ("*Davis*"). Claims 1 and

22 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "wherein scanning the text selection to determine the text reading order for rendering the text selection on the computer-enabled display comprises: determining whether a first portion of the text selection is entered according to a first spoken language, wherein determining whether the first portion of the text selection is entered according to the first spoken language comprises determining whether each character of the first portion of the text selection comprises a character from the first spoken language; determining the text reading order associated with the first spoken language based on the determination that the first portion of the text selection is entered according to the first spoken language." Amended Claim 22 includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 8, lines 4-21.

In contrast, *Davis* at least does not disclose scanning each character in a text selection to determine a language associated with the text selection. For example, *Davis* merely discloses an algorithm used to determine a directionality for bidirectional Unicode text. (See *Davis*, § 1, paragraph 2.) In *Davis*, directional formatting codes are defined to control character ordering when displayed. (See *Davis*, § 1, paragraph 3.) *Davis*'s formatting codes are embedded and can affect the displayed character ordering. (See *Davis*, § 2, paragraph 2.) Furthermore, the Examiner states that *Davis* does not teach alignment. (See Office Action, page 3, line 8.) Accordingly, in *Davis*, text is not scanned to determine whether a character is associated with a spoken language, nor is

alignment determined. Consequently, *Davis* cannot teach text ordering and alignment based on a language determined to be associated with a text selection because *Davis* fails to disclose text language determination or alignment. Rather, *Davis* merely discloses non-displayed directional codes for formatting text.

Davis would not have lead to the claimed invention because *Davis* at least does not disclose, "wherein scanning the text selection to determine the text reading order for rendering the text selection on the computer-enabled display comprises: determining whether a first portion of the text selection is entered according to the first spoken language, wherein determining whether the first portion of the text selection is entered according to the first spoken language comprises determining whether each character of the first portion of the text selection comprises a character from the first spoken language; determining the text reading order associated with the first spoken language based on the determination that the first portion of the text selection is entered according to the first spoken language," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 22 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 22 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 22.

Dependent Claims 2-10, 12, 14-19, and 23-24 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 22, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-10, 12, 14-19, and 23-24.

III. New Claim

Claim 25 has been added to more distinctly define and to round out the protection for the invention to which Applicants are entitled. Applicants respectfully submit that the claim is allowable over the cited references and that it adds no new matter.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Final Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of

patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: August 28, 2008

/D. Kent Stier/

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

